

## Horsham Blueprint

### Question 1: Re. AIM 3 - Aspirational Development Sites (Pages 39/40)

I note that the first sentence of paragraph 7.30 states that “If the sites, described briefly below [in AIM 3], were to become available, development will be resisted unless it accords with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and aspirations for the sites, as set out below”.

Please can the Business Neighbourhood Forum explain why this text purports to be framed as a policy? I note that AIM 3 (along with other AIMs) is an aspiration and has no policy status.

---

Paragraph 7.30 is framed the way it is for the following reason:

The plan contains a number of AIMs. These are matters that Horsham Blueprint wish to encourage as they contribute to the “Vision for Horsham” ; but which for a variety of reasons could not be presented as formal policies.

Paragraph 7.30 is simply making the point that any development of the “Aspirational Sites” will need to comply with the relevant policies – and that it is Blueprints view, that any proposed development should be of the nature indicated e.g. *HB4 Royal Sun Alliance Building: conversion to a hotel*.

Blueprint believes that it would not have been appropriate to formulate a policy in relation to development types for locations that have not been formally identified as development sites within the plan (the plan does not allocate any sites).

However, it is Blueprints view that it would be appropriate for Blueprint to express an opinion on development of any of the sites listed under AIM 3 should it be proposed; and therefore that it is appropriate for Blueprints initial view to be on the public record i.e. recorded in the plan.

---

When preparing this response the Blueprint Steering Committee, looked afresh at the wording of paragraph 7.30 and concluded that it may seem quite formal for what is an “AIM” rather than a “policy”.

If the Examiner considers that an amendment is necessary to make the wording less formal ((and policy-like), and more as a guide to those who will be overseeing the implementation of the policies and actions then perhaps the following suggested revision may suffice:

*“If the sites, described briefly below [in AIM 3], were to become available, the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan has shown support for their development in line with the aspirations as set out below and this should form the basis for discussions with developers and the planning authority. Development will be resisted unless it accords with the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and aspirations for the sites, as set out below”.*